

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,480	03/05/2007	Zhiming Deng	2902246.14	9425
69219 7590 12/17/2007 BAKER DONELSON BEARMAN CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, PC 555 11TH STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			GIBSON, RANDY W	
	6TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2841	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/578,480 ⁻	DENG, ZHIMING
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Randy W. Gibson	2841
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutoric. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statur Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		·
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed	— is action is non-final. ance except for formal matt	· •
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 7-9 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 March 2007</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination 	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obje drawing(s) be held in abeyar ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		<i>*</i>
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A ority documents have been au (PCT Rúle 17.2(a)).	opplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "plural" in line 4 should be –plurality--. Appropriate correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

There are no copies of the references cited by the International Search Authority in the file. Applicant is requested to file an Information Disclosure Statement along with a copy of each of the foreign references cited on the International Search Report so that they may be considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10/578,480 Art Unit: 2841

- 2. Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alreck (US # 6,371,584). Alreck shows a housing that includes a main body (10), a weighing scale (30), a scale casing (inherent) that sits on a sliding plate (20) that slides on guiding rails (Col. 2, lines 10-36) in and out of a chamber (Col. 3, lines 46-52). The intended use statement that the device is a "food treating apparatus" is not deemed to delineate any patentable structure, since the countertop shown is capable of being used for cutting food. With respect to claim 4, Alreck mentions "interlocks" that prevents the rails from sliding completely out. With respect to claims 5 & 6, the front of the drawer is considered to be the "baffle".
- 3. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leisinger et al (US # 5,617,648). Leisinger discloses a housing that includes a main body (1), a weighing scale (3), a scale casing (inherent) that sits on a sliding plate (23) that slides on guiding rails (25) in and out of a chamber (Col. 3, lines 4-14). The intended use statement that the device is a "food treating apparatus" is not deemed to delineate any patentable structure, since the device is capable of holding food in the weighing dish. With respect to claims 5 & 6, element 7 is the "baffle".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

10/578,480 Art Unit: 2841

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leisinger et al. Leisinger disclose the claimed invention except for the use of injection molding for making the plate. However, the examiner takes official notice that injection molding was a well know method for making plastic parts; it would have been obvious to the ordinary practioner to use a know method to make a known part motivated by its art recognized suitability for its intended purpose. See *MPEP* §§ 2144.03 & 2144.07.

Conclusion

6. Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The support rod made up of a plurality of detachable segments is not suggested by the art of record.

10/578,480

Art Unit: 2841

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randy W. Gibson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2103. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri., 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F. Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Randy W. Gibson Primary Examiner Art Unit 2841